

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/057,212	RACZEK, NICO N.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	C. SAYALA	1761	

**All Participants:**

(1) C. SAYALA.

(2) Ms Cathy Moore, Reg # 45764.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 1 April 2004

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*Claim 1 and 9-11*

**Claims discussed:**

*Same as above*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*as applied*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's arguments of unobviousness, based on the examples in the specification, while convincing, does not extend to the entire range claimed in the amendment submitted 3/19/04. Examiner was authorized to make the changes shown in the examiner's amendment so that the case can be placed in issuance. .